

Scripture

THE QUARTERLY OF THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION

VOLUME VIII

JULY 1956

No 3

THE SPIRIT OF GOD

If the essence of religion can be summed up in one phrase, it is this: the union of God with man. This was God's plan for mankind from the beginning, when He walked in the garden with our first parents, until they hid themselves from Him by sin. The rest of the history of the world as the Bible gives it, the history of the Redemption, is the process of restoration of this state of harmony, until it was achieved in an even more perfect form than at first, in the Redemption by Our Lord. It is this which God signified to His people by the concept of 'covenant'—the act of union, act of alliance. And inside the covenant relationship, God's presence among His people was realised in various ways. It was realised by the Law—this is an aspect of this institution which is often overlooked, that 'There is no other nation which has its God so close to it as our God is to us; for what other nation has statutes and precepts like all this law which I, Moses, put before you now' (Deut. 4:7). It was realised in Temple and Tabernacle ('Tent of Meeting'), where God personally came down and dwelt in their midst. And it was realised still more perfectly in the gift of God's 'Spirit.'

In order to appreciate all that 'the Spirit of God' means in the Old Testament, it will be necessary to begin further back than our English word; in fact it will be as well to forget for the moment the connotations of the English term—soul, ghost, disembodied spirit, and so on. The Hebrew word (*rûah*) means first of all 'wind.' It is the word used in Genesis when God walked with Adam and Eve in the cool breeze of evening. It is the word for the wind which dries up the flood. It is the word for the mighty gale which smashes up great ships, in Psalm 47:8. Next, it can mean breath: the psalmist (134:17) scoffs at idols which can neither see nor hear nor breathe—they have not 'spirit' in their nostrils.¹ Both meanings can be seen

¹ It is doubtful which of these senses comes first: is the breath thought of as a little wind whistling through man's nostrils? or is the wind thought of as a breath of God? The latter is suggested by several texts (for example, Ps. 17:16): 'The foundations of the world are laid bare by the blast of the breath of God's nostrils.' But the evolution of sense suggested above—from wind, a movement of air to breath—seems probable; and in any case it does not affect the next and more important step in the argument—from breath to breath of life.

in Psalm 103 : verse 4 speaks of God making the winds ('spirits') His messengers ; and verse 29, He takes away the breath ('spirit') of His creatures and they cease to exist. And in both of these verses we see the danger of reading the text with preconceived, non-Biblical, ideas : reading the Latin version, or the Latin commentators, in verse 4, for example, we would be led to think that it meant that God used 'spiritual beings' as messengers, or angels ; and in verse 29, we would be inclined to take it simply in our sense of 'soul.'

It is true, however, that from this last sense of 'breath,' it is an easy step to the meaning 'breath of life'—breath being that which is most obviously characteristic of a living being. Ecclesiastes, lamenting the inevitability of death, says : 'Man cannot retain his spirit, he has no power over the day of his death.' God sends the flood 'to destroy all that possessed the breath of life'—that is, every living thing. In passages like these, it is tempting to translate the word simply as 'soul.' But Hebrew uses another word for 'soul,' which it uses to denote the thing which is living ; when it uses this word 'spirit,' *ruah*, it has in mind rather the 'livingness' of a thing : not, however, conceived in an abstract way, but on the contrary thought of in a very physical, concrete, way—the breath which shows that a thing is living.

Man is living because he draws breath, because he has 'spirit' in him. And God also is living, because of His spirit. His spirit, like the spirit of man, is His 'livingness.' God is thought of—or rather is spoken of—as if He drew breath like a man ; and as in man, this breath, this spirit, is the sign of His life. Now when God creates, He communicates His own infinite power of life ; and the Bible portrays this for us in an extremely graphic manner as God 'breathing into the nostrils of man' so that man becomes a living being. God 'sends' forth His spirit and all things are created' (Ps. 103:30). That which ~~is~~ breathes : and its breath is a breath of God. Man depends on God's breath for existence ; if it is withdrawn he dies. Job, for instance, protests his life-long innocence 'as long as there is breath in me, as long as God's spirit is in my nostrils.' So truly is it breath of God's breath that Ecclesiastes says that at death 'the dust shall return to the earth as it was, and the spirit to God who gave it.'

Our idea of spirituality, then—that is, immateriality—is not the main impression we are to take from the 'spirit of God.' It is true that there are texts where this might seem to be the sense. Isaias, for instance, warns Israel against trusting Egypt, for 'Egypt is a man and not God ; their horses are flesh, not spirit.' The contrast, however, is not between the corporeal and the spiritual, but between the weak and the powerful ; 'all flesh is grass, and the glory thereof is like the

glory of grass' which fades with the first heat of summer; 'flesh' is man in so far as he is weak and transitory and corruptible. What Isaias is saying, then, is that man and all his strength are weak and incapable of resistance against the strength and vitality, the 'spirit,' of God. The 'spirit of God,' therefore, means, not the spiritual, immaterial nature of God; but His strength, His vitality. It means 'God the living'; it means 'Jahweh'—He who is. And the sacred writers are not concerned with insubstantial metaphysical definitions. Life for them is a dynamic quality. It implies vital and vigorous action. If Jahweh is He who is, He is also He who acts: He is the Lord of life, Creator, Omnipotent.

We have seen that it is by God's spirit breathed into man that man lives. Now the same spirit can give him a share of the divine activity also. It descends on Othniel and Jephthah, it clothes Gideon, it rushes upon Samuel and Saul, to urge them on to the work which they had to do. It may manifest itself in quite prosaic ways, as when the craftsmen in charge of the building of the tabernacle are given God's spirit. It may be given to pagans even, like the prophet Balaam, or foreign kings invading Israel as the agents of God's vengeance (2 Kings 19:7). But in every case we notice that it is directed to the furtherance of the covenant, the union of God and man. It descends on Moses, that he may found God's nation: it descends on the Judges that they may fight God's battles and deliver His people; on the kings, that they may rule God's people in God's name; on the prophets, that they may direct His people by God's own word. This is the people among whom He has desired to dwell, through whom He will be present on earth; and He forms and moulds them to that privilege with preparatory and partial manifestations of it—as we light a fire with fire.

It is sometimes said that the 'spirit of God' is no more than a figurative way of expressing God's action—like the 'arm of the Lord,' or the 'hand of God.' There is certainly some truth in this; but the very comparison with such phrases brings out the difference—'spirit' indicates something much more internal and vital than 'hand' or 'arm'; it suggests God Himself acting in a person, not merely moving him by external assistance or compulsion.

The internal and even moral efficacy of God's spirit becomes more and more evident as the history of Israel progresses.¹ It is the spirit which guides our steps (Ps. 142:10), thus performing the work of the

¹ This is not to be taken as implying that there is any attempt to establish the chronological succession of the texts which follow; it is meant only in the most general sense—that in an earlier stage of the Biblical literature the spirit seems to be looked on particularly as the source of 'superhuman' acts, while in a later stage the stress is on the moral activity of the spirit.

law. In the book of Wisdom, it is the spirit of wisdom, identified with the gift of wisdom, infused into us to show us God's will and to help us to perform it: 'For who can know thy counsel unless thou givest wisdom, and sendest thy holy spirit from above . . . that it may work with me and lead my actions wisely' (Wis. 9:17, 10, 11). In Psalm 50, it is even the principle of moral life: just as God created man by breathing His spirit into him, so it is by His spirit that the sinner recovers from his sins and lives anew: 'Create a clean heart in me, O my God, put a new and upright spirit within me; take not away Thy holy spirit from me.'

The description of the spirit in this last text as God's *holy* spirit is significant. A covenant with a holy God demands holiness in the people: 'Be ye holy, as I the Lord your God am holy.' But the people have sinned, they have broken the covenant, rendered it null and void. So God prepares a new and more perfect covenant: 'Behold the day is coming, says the Lord, when I shall make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Juda: not like the covenant which I made with their fathers, the covenant which they have made void; but I shall write the law in their hearts, and they shall be my people and I shall be their God.' And just as it was by His spirit that God formed and moulded the people for the first covenant, so His spirit will work the spiritual reformation necessary for the new covenant—His spirit, and in particular, the spirit of His holiness. God's holiness is often represented under the figure of fire, burning away all that is opposed to it: 'The light of Israel shall be the fire, the Holy One of Israel shall be the flame which shall burn down the lofty trees of the forest of Assyria' (Is. 10:16 f). And so also God's holy spirit, like a burning wind, shall sweep away the impurity of the people to prepare them for the new covenant. 'On that day all those who are left in Sion shall be called holy: for the Lord will wipe away the filth of the people by the spirit of judgment, a burning spirit' (Is. 4:2-4).

And just as we have seen that Moses, judges, prophets and kings were invested with the spirit of God for the perfection of the first covenant, so he who is to usher in the new covenant is to be filled most perfectly with this spirit. 'Behold my servant, he whom I have chosen to be the covenant of the people—to him I have given my spirit' (Is. 42:1, 6). On him the manifold gift of the spirit comes to rest—it does not merely rouse him like a sudden gust of wind; it imbues him, it becomes his permanent possession (Is. 11:2). But although the Messiah has the fulness of the spirit, it is not an exclusive possession; from him it flows over the whole land and transforms it: 'The spirit is poured out on us, and the desert becomes a garden and

the garden an orchard; and justice will dwell in that desert, and righteousness in that garden; and justice will bring peace' (Is. 32:15-18). This transformation is in fact a new creation; that is the point of Ezekiel's vision of the valley filled with bones; at God's command, bone is joined to bone, becomes clothed in sinews and flesh, and then, with the sound of a mighty wind the spirit of God enters into them and those utterly dead things stand up as living men. So in the new age God will give new life to men. But it will be a spiritual recreation: 'A new heart I will give you and a new spirit I will put in you. I will take away your heart of stone and give you my spirit, and you shall walk according to my law' (Ezech. 36:23-8). In fact, Jeremiah has told us, this law will be written in their hearts. When the first covenant was given, Israel humbly expressed their gratitude that God should be so close to them, guiding them by His law (Deut. 4:7-8); now, how much closer is He, when His own spirit is in them to guide them. Before, they had prophets to teach them God's will and exhort them to do it. Now each of them is to possess that spirit of prophecy himself: 'I will pour out my spirit on all flesh, and your sons and daughters will prophesy: young and old, maid and servant, shall receive my spirit' (Joel 2:28 f).

The new age dawned. 'There came a sound like the rushing of a mighty wind, filling the whole house where the apostles were. And parted tongues like flames settled on each of them; and they were filled with the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with the utterance that the Holy Ghost gave them' (Acts 2:2-4). God has kept His promise; St Peter proclaims that this is the fulfilment of the prophecy of Joel. The Spirit is poured forth in wind and flame, the breath of God's life and the fire of His holiness.

The terminology, the symbols and the action they signify, are the same as in the Old Testament. But between the end of the Old Testament and the writing of the New, a most important step in revelation has been made. It has been revealed that God's life is so great that it needs three Persons to contain it; and that the 'spirit' which they had looked on as being an aspect of the divine activity is in fact a Person. Not that this revelation abolished all previous ways of thought and expression. In the synoptic gospels particularly it is often difficult to decide whether 'spirit' refers to the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, or whether the author is using it in its Old Testament sense, of God's energising action. When Simeon is directed to the temple 'by the spirit,' or when Our Lord is led out into the desert 'by the spirit,' there is no very obvious difference from the spirit which took Ezekiel to Chaldea (Ezech. 11:24). In fact, when Matthew says that Our Lord cast out devils by the 'spirit of God,'

Luke in the parallel passage says that it was due to the 'finger of God,' that is to say, simply by God's power. But the fact remains that the revelation has been made (for instance, it is in the name of the Spirit, as well as in the name of the Father and Son, that the apostles are to baptise). Therefore, even when the word spirit is used in a sense not very different from that of the Old Testament, it seems safe to say that the New Testament revelation would not be far from their minds. They realise that the 'Spirit of God' is not merely a synonym for God, even a particularly expressive one; it does not merely indicate a modality of the divine action: it is in fact the divine nature itself expressed in one of a Trinity of Persons.

All that has been said of the spirit of God in the Old Testament, then, is now transferred to this Person. God breathed His spirit into man so that he became a living being, created 'in the image and likeness of God.' Now the Holy Spirit comes down on a Virgin and the result is not a man in the likeness of God, but God Himself incarnate. In the Old Testament, we have seen, the infusion of the spirit of God was a partial manifestation of that union between God and man which God desires: here, that union is perfected—God becomes man.

But Our Lord is not alone: He is the 'only-begotten of the Father,' but he is also 'first-born among many brethren.' To all who believed in him he gave power to be like himself, sons of God. And how does he do this? By giving them a share in this same Spirit. Isaiah had said that God would 'pour out the spirit on parched ground, His spirit upon all flesh.' And Our Lord cries out: 'If any man thirsts, let him come to me. If anyone believes in me, living waters shall flow in him'—the living water, St John explains, of the Holy Spirit. But this Spirit was not to be given till he himself had gone. Just before his death, Our Lord consoles his disciples by telling them that it was better that he should go, for if he went then he would send the Holy Ghost to them. During his life, he would only be with the men of his time as a friend is with a friend; but when he has died he will make possible a much closer union—they will be joined to him, and his Spirit will be their Spirit. And that is what does happen; we are baptised into Christ Jesus, and 'the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus' becomes our Spirit also. That perfect union between God and man which was achieved in Our Lord's Incarnation is realised also in all those who are one with Christ. Just as God signified His presence among Israel by descending into the temple, so now the Christian himself is the temple of God and the Holy Ghost dwells in him (cf. 1 Cor. 3:16; 6:19). 'We know that we are in Him and He in us, because He has given us His Spirit' (1 John 4:13). The Holy Ghost

is in fact God giving Himself—He *is* the gift, the 'donum.' St Peter exhorts his first converts to be baptised, 'and you will receive the gift of the Holy Ghost': not merely a gift from the Holy Ghost, but the Holy Ghost himself, who can be defined as the 'gift,' the self-giving of God. Similarly, Simon Magus is rebuked because he wanted to buy the power to give the Holy Ghost: 'he thought the gift of God could be bought with money.'

The New Testament revelation allows us to go even a step further in this mystery of God's own giving of Himself. The Old Testament knew God as Creator, Almighty, source of all life; they even knew that He was loving. But it is the final step of New Testament revelation concerning the nature of God to tell us that He is not only loving, but that He *is* love. 'God is love.' When God gives us Himself, therefore, He does so not merely by breathing into us the Spirit of life—it is also the Spirit of love. 'The Love of God is diffused in our hearts through the Holy Spirit who is given to us.' God gives us Himself—His own love for Himself, and His own love also for men: 'Brethren, if God has so loved us, we ought to love each other. And if we love each other, God dwells in us—dwells in us, because He has given us His Spirit' (1 John 4:11-14). The Holy Ghost, then, is not only the principle of union between God and man, but also between man and man. The same life flows in all those who are one body with Christ, and this life is the life of love. So St Paul ends his second epistle to the Corinthians with the blessing that 'the grace of Our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.' He begs the help of their prayers 'through the charity of the Holy Ghost' (Rom. 15:30). He urges them to charity for each other 'through the communion of the Spirit.' They should be anxious 'to preserve the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace—one body and one Spirit' (Eph. 4:3).

They are one body animated by one Spirit. They are sons of God, as Our Lord is Son of God, because they are directed by the Spirit (cf. Rom. 8:14). The Spirit descended on individuals in the Old Testament to direct them to activity in God's cause; and so it does in the New Testament. It is by the Holy Spirit that the first deacons are selected; it is by the Holy Spirit that Philip is directed to his contact with the Ethiopian. Saul and Barnabas are picked out for the work God has for them by the Spirit; and the same Spirit also directs Paul continually in his work, leading him across Asia to Greece, and finally back to Jerusalem for the last trial. The Spirit in the Old Testament filled the rulers of God's people, and fills the rulers of God's people in the New Testament. 'The Holy Spirit has appointed you overseers to rule the church of God,' Paul tells the elders of Ephesus.

And just as the heroes of old were given strength by the Spirit of God to do wonderful deeds, so 'the gospel message has been confirmed by the signs and wonders and manifold deeds of power and gifts of the Holy Ghost' (Heb. 2:4). The various extraordinary charisms which graced the church at Corinth are the overflow of the life of the Spirit in the community, giving to each according to his will.

The New Testament has its judges, heroes, kings: it also has its prophets. There were prophets of the same kind as those of old—like Agabus, who foretold by the Spirit that there was to be a famine (Acts 11:28); and who told Paul, with a symbolic gesture which recalls those of Ezechiel, that the Holy Ghost wished him to know that prison was waiting him in Jerusalem. But the New Testament gift of prophecy is much more far-reaching than this. The Old Testament prophets spoke in virtue of the knowledge which the Spirit infused into them for that purpose. But now that Holy Spirit is the permanent possession of the Christian; it is God in us knowing Himself. 'I will ask the Father and He will send you another Paraclete who will remain with you for ever, the Spirit of Truth . . . you know him, because he is staying with you, he will be in you' (John 14:16 f). All that Christ has been to his own during the years of his earthly career, that the Holy Ghost will be to the Church for ever. Our Lord revealed God to the world: the Holy Ghost takes this revelation and deepens it, allows them to see all that it contains and involves: 'I have spoken thus while I have been among you; but the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, will teach you everything, and bring back to your minds all that I have said.' He is to be 'another Paraclete.' Our Lord is the first paraclete, advocate: 'We have as advocate, paraclete, with the Father, Jesus Christ, the Just' (1 John 2:1). He stands by us, fights our cause, pleads our case. What more effective advocacy could we have than God Himself praying for us: 'We know not what to ask for nor how to ask it; but the Spirit himself prays for us with wordless petition. And God who searches hearts knows what the Spirit desires' (Rom. 8:27). But the Holy Ghost is not only in us pleading our cause with the Father—he is in us pleading Christ's cause to the world: 'I will send you the Paraclete, and he will convict the world of sin and justice and judgment.' He will show them that sin consists essentially in the failure to accept Christ. He will show that Christ's death, which was not an ignominious defeat but a victorious reunion with the Father, has established him as the Just One; and that moreover he has thus established a new principle of justice—not one depending on the fulfilment of the law, but one which attains union with God through union with Christ. He will show them that the judgment they passed on Christ, condemning him

to die, was actually judgment on themselves and on the devil who prompted their actions: 'Now is the hour for the Son of Man to die, now is the Prince of this world cast out.' Christ's work, his role as revealer of the Father and guide of mankind, 'the way, the truth and the life,' is not ended with his death but is continued by his Spirit. And so it is that the Church gives fearless testimony to the Truth, through the Spirit. Peter is filled with the Holy Spirit to address the crowds after the curing of the lame men; the deacons are 'full of the Holy Ghost and of wisdom'; St Stephen spoke with wisdom and the Spirit so that he could not be resisted. They are giving testimony to Christ; they have no need to be timid or afraid, for 'it is not they who speak, but the Holy Spirit which is in them.'

Spirit of action, Spirit of prophecy; and we saw that in the Old Testament the Spirit was also the source of a new spiritual life. And so it is in the New Testament. The adjective 'Holy,' with which the Spirit was qualified in the Old Testament occasionally (not more than half a dozen times in all), is now the regular attribute of the Spirit of God. For this Spirit unites them really to God, gives them a real participation in the Divine Life, and therefore gives them a share in the holiness of God. They are the temples of the Holy Ghost—a sanctified, consecrated dwelling for God. We possess this principle, this seed of holiness; and the rest of our lives should be the development of this seed. St Paul begs his converts not to grieve the Spirit by any imperfection in their lives. Our vocation gives us holiness and lays the obligation of holiness on us: 'If you despise this, you are not despising man but God who put His own Holy Spirit in you' (1 Thess. 4:8).

So finally we come to that which is the most characteristic effect of the Holy Ghost's dwelling within us: joy and peace. These words abound in the Acts of the Apostles, the 'gospel of the Holy Ghost.' The disciples of St Paul and Barnabas are filled with joy and the Holy Ghost (Acts 13:52). The Christian has a source of rejoicing, not in drunkenness, but in the new wine of the Holy Ghost (Eph. 5:18). The Thessalonians receive the word of God 'with the joy of the Holy Ghost' (1 Thess. 1:6). Even in persecution we should see not a cause for sorrow but for further rejoicing, because the Holy Ghost is with us (1 Pet. 4:14).

This last note brings us back to Christ and to the key to the whole doctrine. Our Lord told his own apostles that suffering and persecution were to be the mark and characteristic of their apostolate; and that when they met opposition they were to rejoice, because it was the guarantee of their apostolate: 'The servant is not greater than his master—if they have persecuted me, they will persecute you; and

rejoice and count yourselves blessed when men persecute you, for so they persecuted the prophets' and so must suffer all those who bear witness to the truth. The union between God and man reached its climax and fulfilment in Our Lord. He is the true temple of God, he is the Holy One of God. In his every action and every word he revealed and showed God to men. In so doing, he met with opposition and hatred, which led finally to his death; but by that very death, he achieved the work he had come to do. Now, the role of the Holy Ghost is to make the church the continuation of Christ. They, like him, live with the life of God. They are the temple of God. The church is holy, the spotless bride of Christ. And like Christ it revealed God to men; in fact, not only like Christ—it is the continuation of Christ's witness. 'The Paraclete will bear witness to me and you will bear witness.' Christ reveals God to the world, and the church with the Holy Spirit displays Christ to the world. In so doing, the church will meet opposition; but the Spirit is in the church reassuring them, infusing them with the peace which Christ left them, giving them joy in the following of Christ.

'Rejoice, because your reward is great in heaven.' The Christian rejoices to follow the road of Christ, knowing that this road does not end with the cross but continues to resurrection and new life with the Father. The Spirit is the pledge of this new life—not merely promise, but initial possession. 'You are signed with the Holy Spirit of promise, the pledge of our inheritance' (Eph. 1:13). 'We wait with confidence for the resurrection of our bodies, knowing that God will do this 'who has given us the pledge of the Spirit' (2 Cor. 5:5). We who have the first-fruits of the Spirit long for the completion of our adoption, the resurrection of our bodies (Rom. 8:23).

We end as we began. We began with the spirit of God being breathed into the face of man; we end with a new breath of life from the Holy Spirit of God giving us a life which is supernatural and eternal. St John also ends by taking us back to Genesis and putting the life-giving action of the Spirit in a new perspective. The whole of St John's gospel is a new interpretation of the meaning of creation. He begins with the opening words of all revelation: 'In the beginning . . .'; and at the end we have the echo of those other words of Genesis, when Our Lord breathes on his apostles and says: 'Receive ye the Holy Spirit . . .' To them henceforward is entrusted not merely the life of the Spirit but the perpetual power of conveying that Spirit to others.

L. JOHNSTON

Ushaw

EXCEPT IT BE FOR FORNICATION?

Recently two articles have renewed discussion of the famous texts in Matthew—5:32: 'excepting the cause of fornication'; and 19:9: 'except it be for fornication.' Father Bruce Vawter, C.M.¹ defends the view of the late Canon J. P. Arendzen,² that Christ really said: 'Whosoever putteth away his wife'—I say whosoever, leaving aside all consideration of the '*erwat dabar* of Deut. 24:1—'whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery.' The second article was by Father A. Vaccari, S.J.,³ urging difficulties against this exegesis and supporting the same general view defended by us,⁴ and elaborated with great learning by Father J. Bonsirven, S.J.⁵ which understands the text as meaning: 'Whosoever puts away his wife, unless his union with her is really concubinage, and marries another, commits adultery.'

There are many explanations of these famous texts, of which Fathers Vawter and Vaccari think the following are the most important:

(1) The 'classic' interpretation, sometimes called the traditional Catholic interpretation, which understands the texts as permitting a separation from bed and board, but no true dissolution of the marriage.

(2) The 'Protestant' interpretation, which takes the texts as permitting a true dissolution of the marriage, with freedom to marry again.

(3) The 'inclusive' interpretation, which holds that Christ meant that 'even when adultery has been committed' divorce is forbidden. This interpretation is based upon what Father Vawter calls 'linguistic acrobatics,' which turn the 'except' into 'even including.'

(4) The 'interpretative' explanation, which suggests that Christ gave an exegesis of Deut. 24:1, accepting Shammai's interpretation as the authentic meaning of the Old Law but making no reference to the legislation of the New Law.

(5) The 'preteritive' interpretation, as Father Vawter calls it, which holds that Christ excluded consideration of Deut. 24:1, with its exception in case of '*erwat dabar*'. This is defended by Canon Arendzen and Father Vawter.

(6) The 'rabbinic' interpretation, which holds that Christ in the

¹ *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, xvi, 2 (April 1954), pp. 155-67

² *The Clergy Review*, xxi (July 1941), pp. 23-6

³ *Biblica*, xxxvi (1955), pp. 149-51

⁴ *The Clergy Review*, xx (April 1941), pp. 283-94

⁵ *Le Divorce dans le Nouveau Testament*, Paris, 1948

exceptive phrases referred to an illegitimate marriage. This is defended most recently by Father Vaccari.

The question largely hinges upon the meaning to be given to the word *porneia* in the two phrases *parektos logou porneias* and *me epi porneia*. In explanations (1) and (2) it is taken as meaning adultery; in (3), (4) and (5) it is taken as meaning the same as the 'erwat dabar of Deut. 24:1, that is, something indecent or shameful; whereas in (6) it is taken to mean a *zenuth* marriage, that is, a union which is concubinage.

Against *porneia* meaning adultery the gravest objections are urged. If adultery is meant, why is the normal word *moicheia*, not used, a word which in its verbal form occurs twice in the passage? In Matt. 15:19, as in 1 Cor. 6:9, *moicheia* and *porneia* are used in an obviously different sense; and if an exception is to be made for the precise sin of adultery, it is inexplicable why the appropriate and common word *moicheia*, should not be used. Moreover, the explanations which take *porneia* to mean adultery necessarily fall into other inextricable difficulties. The 'classic' interpretation must take the word *apoluein*, to put away, in two different senses: first of a complete divorce and then of a mere separation from bed and board. In verse 3 of chapter 19 the Jews ask Christ: 'Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for any cause?' and in verse 8, Christ says, 'Moses by reason of the hardness of your hearts permitted you to put away your wives'; in both instances the word *apoluein*, to put away, is taken in the meaning of a complete severance of the bond, with freedom to marry again. Why then in verse 9, 'whosoever shall put away his wife,' should the same word be given a different meaning? And a meaning which would have been scarcely intelligible to the Jews, among whom a legal separation, with the bond remaining, was unknown. Possibly for these reasons this explanation has steadily lost favour with exegetes and it would be difficult to name a single scripture scholar who in recent times has written in its defence.

The 'Protestant' interpretation, which also takes *porneia* as meaning adultery, is excluded not only by the parallel passages in Mark and Luke, and by St Paul, but even by the context of Matt. 19, in which Christ revokes the concession made to Moses and brings marriage back to its original unity, indissoluble by man.

What then of the suggestion that *porneia* corresponds to the 'erwat, the nakedness or shame, of Deut. 24:1? Here divergence between Fathers Vawter and Vaccari is acute. Father Vawter argues that in Matt. 19:3, 'the Pharisees were not asking whether divorce was lawful—a thing taken for granted and explicit in the Law—but what

were the lawful grounds for divorce according to the Law. More directly they were asking whether Hillel's liberal view represented a sound exegesis of Deut. 24:1.' To this question Christ made no direct answer, but affirmed the original unity and indissolubility of marriage. Whereupon the Pharisees abandoned the question about the interpretation of Deut. 24:1, and asked concerning the authority of the Law itself: 'Why then did Moses command to give a bill of divorce and to put away?' 'We are thus prepared,' continues Father Vawter, 'for Christ's pronouncement in verse 9 to include some cognisance of Deut. 24:1, though certainly not an interpretation of it, which he has refused to give, nor an acceptance of its provisions, which he explicitly repudiated. 'It is only natural that the final elucidation of his teaching should conclude, in effect: "I say to you, whoever dismisses his wife—Deut. 24:1, notwithstanding—and marries another, commits adultery." This is exactly what Canon Arendzen held: 'Moses by reason of the hardness of your hearts permitted you to put away your wives, but from the beginning it was not so; hence I say to you that whosoever shall put away his wife—I set aside Deuteronomy's *'erwat dabar*—and marries another, committeth adultery.' Father Vawter adds: 'The most natural acceptance of *me epi porneia* is as a reference to the *'erwat dabar* of Deut. 24:1. The phrase (shame of a thing—something shameful) has an even more precise equivalent in the *logos porneias* of Matt. 5:32. The Matthean formula is obviously dependent upon Deuteronomy. The best assumption is that the Greek *Matthew* has translated the Semitic expression of Our Lord with a phrase that by common consent had come to represent the legal form derived from Deuteronomy and which was used in preference to the wooden *aschemon pragma* of LXX. . . . That *me epi porneia* and *parektos logou porneias* are allusions to *'erwat dabar* seems to be beyond question.'

Nevertheless, Father Vaccari not only questions the matter, but judges that it is not even probable that *logos porneias* corresponds to *'erwat dabar*. He argues first, that the grammatical structure is different; the Hebrew word *'erwat* is in the construct, and *dabar* in the absolute, giving the literal translation 'the nakedness or shame of a thing'; whereas in the Greek, the word *porneias* is in the genitive and modifies *logos*, that is, 'a matter of impurity or uncleanness.' Secondly, the expression *'erwat dabar* refers to a physical indecency rather than to a moral one. Father Vaccari instances Deut. 23:14, where the expression *'erwat dabar* is used of uncovered excrement, and could not possibly be translated by *logos porneias*, since *porneia* means a sexual sin. This argument of Father Vaccari's can be confirmed by reference to a multitude of places in the Old Testament—for instance, Gen. 9:22;

Exod. 20:26 ; Lev. 20:11 ; 18:8, etc. ; Is. 20:4—where the primary meaning of *'erwat* is nakedness, and only reductively shame or indecency. In these passages of the Old Testament the *aschemon pragma* of the Septuagint fits perfectly and the *logos porneias* would not fit at all. It is significant that Hatch and Redpath, in their Concordance to the Septuagint, give not a single instance where the word *porneia* corresponds to the Hebrew *'erwat*. It is significant, also, that Delitzsch in his Hebrew translation of the New Testament, renders the *logos porneias* of Matt. 5:32, by *debar zenuth* and not by *'erwat dabar*. Linguistically, then, Father Vaccari seems fully justified in denying Father Vawter's contention that the *logos porneias* must correspond to the *'erwat dabar* of Deuteronomy.

Father Vaccari moreover, disagrees with Father Vawter's opinion that in Matt. 19 'we are prepared for Christ's pronouncement in verse 9 to include some cognisance of Deut. 24:1.' In fact, the whole question about the law in Deuteronomy has been dismissed already by Christ's words that it was merely a concession made by God because of the hardness of their hearts and that in the beginning it was not so. The Mosaic concession is thus fully and finally rejected, and after this it would be both needless and confusing to revert to the *'erwat dabar*. In Matt. 5:31 and 32, such a suggested introduction of this Mosaic concession would be strained in the extreme : 'It hath been said, whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a bill of divorce. But I say to you, that whosoever shall put away his wife, excepting the cause of fornication, maketh her to commit adultery : and he that shall marry her that is put away, committeth adultery.' Nothing about *'erwat dabar* has occurred in the previous verses, and the introduction of an obscure phrase from Deuteronomy, so to speak out of the blue, definitely weakens Christ's clear and forceful rejection of the provisions of the Old Law.

Further, this exegesis, which takes *porneia* as corresponding to *'erwat*, is obliged to give a most forced and unnatural explanation both of the *parektos* and of the *me epi*. Father Vawter and Canon Arendzen think that both are really equivalent to 'irrespective of,' 'setting aside,' 'even admitting,' the *'erwat dabar*. Canon Arendzen says : 'Can *parektos* bear this meaning : "irrespective of, setting aside, independently of," or equivalent expressions ? It is a very rare word. Outside the New Testament it is found only twice in the Greek literature of the period. In the *Didache* 6:1, "Take heed lest any make thee to go astray from this way of teaching, seeing he teaches thee *parektos theou*," the meaning can only be "irrespective of God, without His Sanction." In the other known passage *The Testament of the Twelve Apostles*, Zebulon 1:4, *parektos ennoias* does not mean

"except reason, but "outside, contrary to, reason." St Paul uses the term twice. In 2 Cor. 11:28 *choris tōn parektos* refers to the troubles which came to the Apostle from outside, in contrast to the mental anxieties which came from within. In Acts 26:29, St Paul wishes all men to be like him *parektos tōn desmōn*. It might in this case be translated "except these bonds," but equally well "without these bonds" or even "notwithstanding these bonds." Thus the fundamental meaning of *parektos* seems to be "outside," i.e. "beyond, independently of," and hence "irrespective of."

Canon Arendzen's comments, however, do not appear to prove what he means them to prove, namely, that *parektos logou porneias* may mean 'independently of' in the sense that *porneia* is ruled out of consideration, and consequently that a man may not dismiss his wife even if there is *porneia*. In the *Didache*, *parektos theou* means that God is definitely excluded from the teaching, and if God appears in the teaching, then it is not *parektos theou*; and similarly, the case of the dismissal of the wife is changed if *porneia* appears. In Zebulon i:4, the teaching in question is not one 'independent of reason' in the sense that reason may or may not be present, but is a teaching clearly 'outside' reason, in which there is no reason. Similarly the dismissal of the wife must be 'outside' the case of *porneia*, and not a dismissal which may or may not be occasioned by *porneia*. In 2 Cor. 11:28, St Paul contrasts the troubles from 'without' with the troubles within; and similarly the dismissal of the wife without *porneia* would be in contrast to a dismissal with *porneia*. The same is true of Acts 26:29. St Paul wishes his converts to be like him, but not to be in bonds, and it is quite unreasonable to try to make St Paul mean a mere setting aside all consideration of the bonds, so that, in effect, he would wish them to be like himself, whether in bonds or not. He clearly does not wish them to be in bonds. Similarly, the dismissal of the wife is one in which there is not *porneia*; it is not a dismissal whether there is *porneia* or not.

But can the exceptive phrase *parektos logou porneias* refer, not to the mere dismissal, but to the whole of Christ's declaration, so that the meaning is: 'I say to you that whoever puts away his wife—and I say this whatever may be the interpretation of *'erwat dabar* in Deuteronomy—and marries another, he commits adultery'? If that were the meaning, it would be far more natural that the phrase should read: 'I say to you, *parektos logou porneias*, whoever puts away his wife etc.' The *parektos* is manifestly exceptive, and if the exception is to the whole logion of Christ, it is strange that it is not placed where it would clearly be so. Further, if the *logos porneias* corresponds to *'erwat dabar*, then the meaning would seem, on this hypothesis, to be that what

Christ says does not consider the '*erwat dabar*, not that he rules out consideration of it ; it he were to consider it, what he says might be different. But, in fact, *parektos* excludes not mere consideration of a thing, but the thing itself ; it does not mean 'irrespective of' a thing, but without it.

Thus even in Chapter 5 there is no support for the idea that the phrase is not truly exceptive ; in Chapter 19, however, the *me epi porneia* is so adverse to the suggestion that the case of '*erwat dabar* is passed over as irrelevant, that Canon Arendzen is forced to conclude either that it is a mistranslation of the Aramaic, or else that the true reading is the same as in Chapter 5, *parektos logou porneias*. It is true that some manuscripts, including the Vaticanus and the Codex Beza have the same reading of the phrase in Chapter 19 as in 5 ; but they are so few that scarcely any editor dares to incorporate it into his text, against the overwhelming majority of the manuscripts. Recourse to so far-fetched expedients is almost a confession that the case is hopeless.

Taking all these reasons together, it seems less likely that *porneia* refers to the '*erwat dabar* of Deuteronomy, and we are left with the suggestion that it means an illegitimate marriage. The word is used in 1 Cor. 5:1: 'It is absolutely heard that there is *porneia* among you . . . that one should have his father's wife,' as meaning an incestuous and illegitimate marriage ; and in Acts 15:20, it almost certainly means a marriage contrary to Jewish law, as Father Vawter agrees. The word, however, as Father Bonsirven has shown, is not used exclusively for incest, but is a general word meaning unlawful intercourse. In John 8:41, the Jews say to Christ, 'we are not born of *porneia*,' that is, we are legitimate children of Abraham, a meaning confirmed by many texts of the Old Testament, where to be born of *porneia* is to be illegitimate, Gen. 38:24 ; Num. 14:33, etc. *Pornogenes* means one born illegitimate. St Paul says that Esau was a *pornos*, Heb. 12:16, and reference to Gen. 26:34, 35 and 27:46, shows that Esau committed *porneia* in that he took foreign women as his wives. Consequently, Bonsirven, Zerwick and Vaccari think that the text means 'Whosoever dismisses his wife—unless she is not really his wife—and marries another, commits adultery.'

Father Vaccari points out that in Hebrew and Aramaic and New Testament Greek the same word is used to signify a legitimate wife and an illegitimate associate, and the same is true of a husband. Christ said to the Samaritan woman : 'Thou hast had five husbands—andras—and he whom thou now hast is not thy husband' (John 4:18). The same word is used for a legitimate wife, for one in the position of the Samaritan woman, and for Herodias the 'wife' of Herod, Mark 6:18. Herein lies the answer to the objection raised by Canon Arendzen,

that the explanation proposed would make Christ's words tautological, as meaning, 'If a man putteth away his wife—except of course when she is not his wife—he committeth adultery.' The meaning rather is : 'If a man puts away his "woman," unless she is not his true wife, he commits adultery.'

Against this explanation, Father Vawter says : 'The objections against applying this meaning to Matt. 5:32 and 19:9, are of the logical order. It is difficult to see how the reservation envisaged by this theory would fit the context of 5:32, where the argument involves the perfecting of the Mosaic Law, not perpetuating its refinements. In 19:9, it would be simply an irrelevancy. Here the law of Deut. 24:1, whatever its original perview may have been, is certainly being used by the Pharisees as the legal sanction for divorce in the strict sense, conceived by them as a privilege which God conceded to his people to the exclusion of the gentiles. In declaring the revocation of the Mosaic concession, why should Christ be imagined to have introduced gratuitously a matter governed by entirely different legislation, concerning which there was no controversy, and about which the Pharisees needed neither reassuring nor correction ? 'To what purpose, moreover, would our Lord have confirmed the invalidity of *zenuth* marriages ? Surely not to make the law of Leviticus and its derivatives normative for his Church. In Acts 15:20, 29, the prohibition of *porneia* and the observance of the kosher laws are imposed by the Apostles as a compromise in the Judaizing controversy to avoid forcing an issue by giving needless offence to Jewish sensibilities. The very fact that such a law was formulated should tell us that there was no logion of Christ relating to the matter.'

Here Father Vawter makes an acute objection, reinforced by his learned study of the question ; but as Father Vaccari points out, the objection is not conclusive. In Matt. 5:32, Christ is by no means 'perpetuating the refinements' of the Mosaic law, but is merely adding the exception in order to avoid cavil on the part of the Pharisees and to make his teaching clear. No doubt the case of John the Baptist having urged the dismissal of Herodias gave point to the exception made by Christ, and the case of the Samaritan woman shows that illegitimate unions were by no means unknown. In contrasting his law with that of Moses, Christ most reasonably added the exception in order to make clear that he did not mean to impose the obligation of retaining a 'woman,' even though in some sense she was like a wife, but yet was not a true wife. Moreover, is it so certain that the Pharisees needed no correction on the matter ? They would appear to have connived at the 'marriage' of Herod and Herodias, for denunciation of which John lost his life.

By the exceptive phrase about *porneia* Christ did not impose the Levitical norms for legitimate marriage, but only declared that where the norms in actual force were violated, there was reason for dissolution of the marriage. Among the Jews those norms were in fact Levitical, and consequently Matthew, writing primarily for Jews, had more reason to mention the matter of *porneia* than had Mark and Luke, who wrote rather for gentiles. It is clear from Acts 15 that there was, early in Christian history, considerable discussion about the matter among Hebrew converts, and the Council of Jerusalem may well have legislated before Matthew's Gospel was written, with full knowledge that Christ had spoken in this sense.

In so complex a matter, where Scripture scholars differ, one must speak cautiously. Father Vaccari's conclusion, however, seems acceptable: the view which holds that the *porneia* of Matt. 5:32 and 19:9 means an illegitimate marriage is supported by sound reasons and avoids difficulties inherent in other explanations. On this view it is manifest that real divorce, involving a breaking of the marriage bond, is utterly excluded. The texts of Mark, Luke, and of Paul fit happily into this explanation and, indeed, are themselves explained and confirmed by it. 'Whosoever putteth away his wife—unless his union with her is illegitimate—and marries another, committeth adultery.'

BERNARD LEEMING, S.J. AND R. A. DYSON, S.J.

QUMRAN AND CHRISTIANITY

When documents can fetch as much as three pounds sterling per square inch it may be supposed that they are not uninteresting. These we speak of are associated with Khirbet Qumran, the ruined remains of the headquarters of that semi-monastic, semi-eremital body of priestly penitents known as the Community of the Alliance. For our purpose it is precise enough to say that they occupied the site and the caves in its neighbourhood from the end of the second century B.C. to the first A.D., finally deserting it when the Tenth Legion marched on Jericho on its way to the siege of Jerusalem (A.D. 67).

All the world knows of the 1947 discovery (Cave 1). The hunt was up, and the Arabs are still scouring the rock-face west of the Dead Sea. Their most rewarding find was that of Cave 4 in September 1952. This mass of new material has forced the recruitment of a small team of scholars who are carrying on with their work conscious of the popular impatience but fortunately not disturbed by it. More than once Père de Vaux, director of the investigation,

has had to protect his team by protesting that it is not yet the time for syntheses—still less for popularisations.¹ The greater part of the texts remains to be published and the explorations themselves are not entirely completed. Only the manuscripts of Cave 1 are as yet available to the public²; it is calculated however that while the finds of Caves 2, 3, 5 and 6 can be published in one volume, Cave 4 will demand three or more.³

In these circumstances it is premature to offer appraisals that claim to be complete and final. It is true that even angels have not feared to tread this insufficiently charted ground, but the venture has not been entirely without damage. The brilliant intuitions even of a Dupont-Sommer were set down side by side with too bold a portrait of the Teacher of Righteousness, founder of the sect, in terms of the Christian belief and hope.⁴ The author later admitted that this was 'a parallel hastily drawn to prick the curiosity of his readers.'⁵ In our own country, and more recently, an excellent series of talks was somewhat marred by similar suggestions which, though offered as such, were likely to mislead an uncritical public.⁶ Granted that the niceties of scholarly debate are not for the uninstructed ear, it still remains our duty to indicate the dissent of other scholars when it exists. Thus the reading of the Habacuc commentary which is said to refer to the violent death of the Teacher is very much disputed. In the same way it might be wise to await the publication of other editions of the Community's famous *Manual of Discipline*, now being studied, before we draw firm conclusions from the one edition available. And as for the ready intervention of the unqualified one can only apply to this the severe but just verdict—or epitaph—earned by the French popular journals: 'The Press is no longer interested and it would be better if it never had been.'⁷

¹ *Revue Biblique*, 1953, p. 625; 1955, p. 632

² J. T. Milik, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, vol. i, 1955

³ *Revue Biblique*, 1956, p. 51

⁴ *Apreçus préliminaires sur les manuscrits de la Mer Morte*, Paris, 1950. The Teacher was said to have been regarded as a divine being incarnate; he was a redeemer put to death and his second coming was expected.

⁵ *Nouveaux aperçus...*, Paris, 1953, p. 207

⁶ Mr John M. Allegro in the Northern Home Service Radio programme, 16, 23 and 30 January at 7.15 p.m. Mr Allegro is assistant lecturer in Comparative Semitic Philology at Manchester University. He became a member of the team of scholars working at the Rockefeller Museum, Jordan, in October 1953. Other members of the team dissociated themselves at least from certain impressions produced by the talks in a letter to *The Times*, 16 March 1956. In his reply in the same newspaper a few days later the speaker called attention to the tentative nature of his reconstruction. He had said that in all probability the Teacher had been handed over to the gentiles to be crucified, and carefully taken down from his cross; the body was lovingly watched over by his disciples in the expectation of its resurrection. The speaker's terms had been chosen to match those of the Gospels.

⁷ J. Delorme in *L'Ami du Clergé*, 1955, p. 656

These things said in dispraise of temerity, a word of warning is necessary against its more dangerous opposite which is indifference or inertia. It is not for the Catholic mind, that takes so naturally to the idea of living tradition, to ignore the voice of the Jewish tradition before Christ.¹ The Spirit assuredly did not cease to guide the nation that produced Zachary, Elizabeth, Mary herself—the 'poor of God,' outstanding surely but not isolated. The hiatus between the Biblical economies is therefore literary and canonical only; between the economies themselves there is no rupture. But if there are traces of this continuity it behoves us to study them. We are speaking of the light the new discoveries throw not on the Biblical text² but on the religious mind, or one corner of it, with which our Lord with his precursor and his followers had to do. They are a thin shaft of brightness falling on some part of the cradle of the Word made flesh. We welcome it, for the dichotomy is false that is implied in a recent popular book on our subject, namely that 'the rise of Christianity should at last be generally understood as an episode in human history rather than propagated as dogma and divine revelation.'³ The supernatural and the historical are not two incompatibles, though they be incommensurables; even Incarnation, assumption of a finite nature by the Infinite, cannot exhaust the Word of God to man, but the Catholic at least holds it to be a divine intervention in history. The Word was made flesh: history is revelation.

Infant Christianity and Qumran had this first thing in common, that they were two spiritual communities, existing together in time and not far distant in place, each of which was cut off from the body of official Judaism. It is indeed a symptom of their deep difference that while this official Judaism had resisted advances from Christianity it had been itself deserted by Qumran; nevertheless, each would understand the other when it addressed Pharisees and Sadducees as a 'brood of vipers.' But Christianity's confrontation was Qumran's withdrawal. For lack of more offensive weapons the 'sons of Sadoq'—the leaders claimed physical descent—chose this form of protest against a usurped high-priesthood. For them the Maccabean movement had gone wrong: the holy war against Syrian Hellenism had not restored the legitimate Sadoquite priesthood. From the time of Jonathan (161-143 B.C.), brother of Judas Maccabeus, the high office had remained in the Maccabean family. What remained for the sons of Sadoq? Retirement in hope that God would reassert the ancient right. So they withdrew, taking as their interim charter—as

¹ And after too, no doubt. But this is another and more difficult question.

² Though indeed they begin to make a history of the Old Testament text appear at last possible.

³ E. Wilson, *The Scrolls from the Dead Sea*, New York, 1955, p. 108

Christianity was later to do—the words of the Book of Consolation (Is. 40:3): ‘Prepare in the wilderness the way of our God.’

In what did the preparation consist? Not in warlike exercise. It seems true to say that the Qumran sect was not pacifist as the Jehovah's Witness are not pacifist,¹ though when we read its ‘War’ scroll (or ‘Fighter's Manual’) we must bear in mind Dodd's warning on the interpretation of the eschatological combats in Ezechiel and Daniel.² The military dispositions are minute and, it is said, modelled on the Roman technique; but on the other hand there is a ritual character attaching to them³ which suggests unreality. But this at least should be said, that the ‘War’ scroll is a most bitter expression of hatred for all that is not Jewish and a blueprint for vengeance. We are very far from Christianity. ‘Jesus could, no doubt, have launched a holy war, and would have found many enthusiastic followers had he done so. But it is as certain as anything can be that he rejected the whole conception of such a warfare—whether in the immediate Zealot form or in the deferred Qumran form—in favour of the way of the Suffering Servant.’⁴ The war of our Apocalypse (e.g. 20:7 ff) is not against flesh and blood; nor is there even in the known Jewish literature anything to match the fierce attacks upon individuals, unnamed but recognisable, that we find in Qumran's commentary on Habacuc.⁵

This for our sense of proportion. But let us see the reverse of the coin. Abstention from the official cult, though only a temporary measure, promoted a detached and more thoughtful spirituality. The first line of the *Manual of Discipline* firmly lays down St Benedict's rule: ‘To seek God.’ Needless to say, whoever enters the Community takes oath ‘to devote himself to the Law of Moses . . . as it has been revealed to the sons of Sadoq’ and ‘as revealed from time to time and as the Prophets have revealed it through the holy spirit,’ but these qualifications in themselves and in their historical situation prepare us for a more generous interpretation than that of the Pharisees and for a different emphasis.⁶ In fact they made way for the ‘mercy and

¹ Bruce, *New Testament Studies*, 2, 1956, p. 188, quotes the reported statement of the international leader of the Witnesses at Twickenham in August of 1955; ‘they were conscientious objectors in relation to wars of the present order, they were not absolute pacifists; they believed in a war—the eschatological warfare of Armageddon.’

² C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, London, 1952, p. 73: ‘We shall be wise to treat the entire scheme of imagery as language appropriate to describe that which lies upon the frontier of normal experience, which therefore cannot be directly communicated by plain speech.’

³ *Nouvelle Revue Théologique*, 1955, pp. 372–99

⁴ *New Testament Studies*, I.c.

⁵ *Biblica*, 1954, p. 343

⁶ Owing, doubtless, to its withdrawal from the Temple, Qumran seems at times to pass beyond the salutary emphasis of the Prophets almost to a condemnation of sacrifice.

not sacrifice' theme of the Prophets¹ and enabled a metaphorical interpretation of the Mosaic sacrificial system. In place of that system stood the careful observance of the Community's rules which, under the good pleasure of God, would expiate sin. For consciousness of guilt is not the least admirable nor the least Christian quality of Qumran which regarded itself as a home of penitents. Such a reaction from the *insouciance* of the Sadducees and self-sufficiency of Pharisaism inevitably brought with it a total personal committal to the divine mercy, a higher perception of what we call 'grace.' In these circumstances it seems to us unjust to accuse the sect of a Calvinistic predestination doctrine: the emphasis on God's *dominium* has provoked the same accusation at more advanced stages of theology, and still unjustly; in a time and milieu where speculation was not acceptable and formulas unmade, the accusation is an anachronism. As in the New Testament itself the two data of divine choice and human effort appear side by side without a reconciling philosophy; may it be that human experience in prayer as in effort can do without one? And so, if we may resume, in place of the sacrificial vocabulary we find recurring at Qumran the words 'truth, humility, justice, love of goodness, mercy.' We can guess at our Lord's approval who once said to the Pharisees: 'You have left the weightier things of the Law: justice and mercy and faith' (Matt. 23:23).

The concluding Blessing of the *Discipline Manual*, reminiscent of the *Benedictus* of Zachary the Sadoqite, father of the Baptist,² well expresses the substantial piety of Qumran: 'Blessed be Thou, my God, who throwest wide the heart of Thy servant to receive knowledge. . . .³ Grant to the son of Thy handmaid to stand before Thee for ever. For without Thee no way is perfect: without Thy good pleasure nothing can be done.'

Here at Qumran we have a notable preparation of heart for a worship in spirit and in truth, centred not on this mountain nor on that; for a religion Jewish in its origins which could yet survive, even thrive upon, the destruction of the Holy City itself. Such a revelation was Qumran to the few. Theirs was the lesson the Babylonian exile had read to the many. And yet the Community maintained a shadow hierarchy ready to take over in the great day of the Visit, of the divine rescue and renewal of Jerusalem, whenever it should come. The

¹ Amos 5:24; Os. 6:6; Is. 1:11-17; Mich. 6:6-8

² *Revue Biblique*, 1955, pp. 41-2

³ 'When *da'at*, "knowledge," and related terms appear in the *Manual of Discipline*, it is seldom a question of knowledge in the modern, intellectual, sense of the word. And the underlying idea is scarcely ever to be identified with the more abstract "gnosis" of Gnosticism' (Bo Reicke in *New Testament Studies*, 1, 1954, p. 138). Here it is acknowledgment and performance of God's will.

true perspective of the Temple was not permanently achieved. Christianity on the other hand seems to have grasped it firmly from its earliest days and so stood braced for universality. Already in the thirties of the first century Stephen puts the Temple in its due place (Acts 7:44-50); his confidence was surely based upon deduction from the words of Jesus (e.g. Mark 14:58; cf. John 2:19-21). Temple, priesthood and sacrifice were all and already gathered into one in the person of Christ. On this point as on others it is the intervention of that person in history which reveals the gulf (though it offers the bridge, too), between Christianity and Qumran.

By the very force of their origins, therefore, the sectaries were sharply aware of an unfaithful Israel that had compromised with paganism. From this Israel they had seceded and their secession had drawn a clear line between two camps. To use their own expression: 'the sons of light' had withdrawn from 'the sons of darkness.' These two were not yet at grips, nor would be until the eschatological combat was engaged. Rather, the present duty of the sons of light was to refuse all contaminating contact: not one of them would have sat down to eat with Simon the Pharisee. Nevertheless, the 'spirit of lies' which¹ directed the camp of darkness could and did pass into the camp of light, contending for mastery in the heart of each member whose destiny turned upon the issue. In this struggle, despite expressions suggesting a fatality in the distribution of the opposing spirit to each man, it seems clear that human free-will is truly in action.

The 'sons of light or darkness' terminology is not without parallel even in the Synoptic gospels (Luke 16:8) and of itself is perhaps a natural enough Hebraism² though not found in the Old Testament. But the persistence and pervasion of the light-dark motif is noticeable in both the Scrolls and the Johannine literature, and this emphasis is impressive. There is at least a common background of thought and of expression. In many cases of likeness between the Qumran literature and the New Testament appeal may legitimately be made to the Old Testament as a common source. This is scarcely possible here. The dualism³ implied in the light-dark opposition and expressed by the doctrine of the two spirits is foreign to the Old Testament and indeed to indigenous Hebrew thought. Infiltration from the uncompromising dualism of Zoroastrianism is not unlikely⁴; through the further filter of the

¹ Or 'who.' It appears so far impossible to decide whether the 'spirits' are persons or motive-powers.

² This view is argued by G. Graystone in *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 1956, p. 33.

³ The dualism of Qumran is of course modified: the two 'spirits' are created and controlled by the one God.

⁴ cf. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, 1955, pp. 405 ff

Qumran school of thought it may have passed to St John's gospel and first epistle. In this, as in many other respects, the fourth gospel may begin to display evidence of more Jewish contacts than many critics have been willing to concede.

But it is the style of the edifice rather than the choice of quarry that distinguishes an author's thought. We have said that Qumran was a withdrawal, Christianity a confrontation; because while the one lived on expectation the other was confident it had received. For our Essene sect¹ light and darkness pursued their parallel courses and the combat was reserved for the future. For St John—and this is the nerve of the matter—light and dark had already engaged decisively: and the light shone in the darkness and the darkness did not master it. The prince of this world (the *Mastema* of Qumran, the equivalent *Satan* of John) was already cast out, already judged. In such terms Jesus saluted the hour of his crucifixion, the hour of his triumph. Qumran could say 'the hour cometh,' but John could add 'and now is.'

With their hope for a happy future this 'Community of the Alliance' connected the manifestation of a messianic figure. In this they are in line with the Prophets. But in the days of the monarchy the hope had naturally been associated with the dynasty; after the Exile when a high priest replaced the Davidic king the same hope, equally naturally, attached to the priesthood also. Thus in Zacharias (4:1-14; 519 B.C.) Josue the Sadoqite priest and Zorobabel the Davidic prince stand together as portents of the messianic age. Subsequently the emphasis changes: royal messianism recedes, though does not disappear; sacerdotal messianism comes to the fore. Thus Ecclesiasticus (45:6-24; c. 190 B.C.) stresses the priestly hope, and an apparently contemporary hand has substituted Josue the priest for Zorobabel in Zacharias 6:11. But the Davidic and the Sadoqite Messiahs both appear (the Davidic first) in the psalm the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus inserts between Ecclus. 51:12 and 51:13.²

Against this background we must read the hope of Qumran. For it seems established³ that there also two Messiahs were expected to manifest themselves in the latter days: 'the Priest' and 'the Messiah of Israel.' In that priestly community it is not surprising that the Sadoqite 'Priest' takes precedence over the 'Messiah of Israel,' a layman. He is to preside at the banquet at the end of times and sing

¹ That Qumran was an Essene foundation is an opinion gaining in favour.

² cf. *Bible de Jérusalem*, note ad loc.

³ This interpretation, originally proposed by Fr. J. T. Milik in *Verbum Domini*, 1951, p. 152, and cf. *Revue Biblique*, 1953, pp. 290-2, is gaining acceptance; cf. Kuhn in *New Testament Studies*, 1, 1955, pp. 168-79.

the praises of the victories won by the Messiah of Israel over the camp of darkness. The Sadoqite and Davidic hopes, therefore, coexist though the Davidic is subordinate.¹

While the messianism of Qumran remained in suspense Christianity, though it too looked forward, was convinced that it had already reached the end-time. In the New Testament, moreover, the variegated strands of the messianic hope are found woven into one tapestry. The Son of David, Son of Man, Suffering Servant expiating sin² are all identified in one person, gathered into a powerful synthesis initiated by an embracing and creative mind.³ But one problem still remained: the priesthood of a Davidic Messiah. For its own part Qumran could not suggest that Priest and King might be united in one figure—Levitical and Judan origin were clearly irreconcilable. It is to this question that the inspired author of the *Epistle to the Hebrews* addresses himself. He dissolves the duality of Qumran's messianic hope by claiming for our Lord a priesthood 'after the fashion of Melchisedech.' By a method of argument calculated to appeal to those familiar with the verbal ingenuity of *midrash* interpretation he demonstrates the superiority of that pre-Mosaic priesthood over the priesthood of Levi and so of Sadoq (Heb. 7:1-19). There is no dilemma therefore; Jesus of Juda cannot be a Levitical priest, but he enjoys an office that is not tribal; it is universal and not less but more from God, for indeed 'the Law could not achieve what is perfect.'⁴

That the New Testament must be appraised as controversy before it is assessed as history is no doubt a statement to be greeted with caution, but it must at least be recalled that the inspired authors wrote for a public which had its own interests and difficulties. In this matter of the priestly Messiah we have an example which, maybe, is close to our subject. It is worthy of notice that *Hebrews* by insisting upon the Aaronic priesthood is, equally with the Qumran sect, hostile to the non-Aaronic Sadducees who were in possession: 'No-one,' says the Epistle, 'must take this dignity to himself: he must be called by God, precisely as Aaron was' (5:4). But this very principle would seem to oppose Qumran to the priesthood of Jesus of Juda. Hence the manifest anxiety of the author to deal with the difficulty. Is it too bold to suppose that he had the sectaries in mind? It is in the

¹ It is unfortunate that the third Isaiah commentary, apropos Is. 10:22-11:4, expressly mentioning a Davidic Messiah, is torn. The MS is one of Mr Allegro's group. He mentions that the tear is new and that there is hope of recovering the remainder; cf. *Revue Biblique*, 1956, p. 62.

² The notion of expiation by the few on behalf of the many is found in the *Manual of Discipline* (cf. 8:6-10; 9:4).

³ cf. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, p. 109; the creative mind is our Lord's.

⁴ cf. *Revue Biblique*, 1955, pp. 35-7

first place inconceivable that the early Christian preachers should ignore the truly spiritual aspirations and difficulties of this *élite* of Israel, provided they were in touch with it. That they did meet is surely probable. It is known that there were pockets of Essene members or sympathisers in every town of Palestine; ancestors of Qumran itself had migrated as far afield as Damascus forty years after the death of the Teacher of Righteousness¹; in Ephesus supporters of the Baptist, and therefore presumably acquainted with Qumran, were installed (Acts 19:1-4). Christian contact with such groups would go far towards explaining not only the background of the Epistle to the Hebrews, but also the indications of relationship between Qumran and the Johannine literature, possibly even the less certain affinity of phrases in the Pauline epistles.²

Relative to this question of messianism is the use the New Testament makes of the Old Testament. Rendel Harris's theory of a pre-New Testament volume of 'Testimonies' may appear extravagant,³ but the evidence of the New Testament texts at least demands lesser florilegia⁴ with which Christianity could illustrate its continuity with Israel and the unity of the divine plan. Qumran now offers support. One of the documents of Mr Allegro's group⁵ is an anthology of messianic passages from Exodus, 2 Samuel, Isaiah, Amos, Psalms, Daniel. A leaf from Cave 4 lists Deut. 18:18-19 ('I will raise them up a prophet,' etc.) with Num. 24:15-17 ('A star shall rise out of Jacob,' etc.) and Deut. 33:8-11 ('Thy perfection and Thy doctrine—shall be—with thy holy one'). Of these three texts the first is used in the earliest days of Christianity (Acts 3:22 f). The second, though not found in the New Testament, is used by Justin Martyr in the second century and doubtless lies behind the Star incident in St Matthew's account of the Infancy. The well known 'Stone' cycle of applications deriving from the 'precious cornerstone' of Isaiah 28:16⁶ is also represented in Qumran. There the trusty stone is identified with the council of the Community.⁷ For the early Christians the

¹ If the Teacher is to be identified with the high priest Onias III, he died in 171 B.C. But perhaps more probably he was a personality of Alexander Jannaeus's reign (103-76 B.C.), or possibly even of the Pompeyan period (c. 67 B.C.). The identification of the sect with the Ebionites and of the Teacher with Our Lord himself is no longer possible: the evidence that the Community was in existence several decades before Christ is now conclusive. Nor was the Teacher regarded as Messiah in the strict sense.

² On this last cf. W. Grossouw, *Studia Catholica*, 1952, pp. 1-5; S. E. Johnson, *Harvard Theological Review*, 1955, pp. 157-65.

³ Dodd, l.c., pp. 23-7.

⁴ Cerfaux, *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux*, 1954, vol. 2, p. 226.

⁵ *Revue Biblique*, 1956, p. 63. In the letter we have referred to Mr Allegro writes: 'An article now in the course of preparation will lay most of the new messianic material before scholars in the next few months.'

⁶ cf. V. Taylor, *The Names of Jesus*, 1954, pp. 93-9.

⁷ cf. *Zeitschrift f.d. A. T. Wissenschaft*, 1954, p. 113.

stone is our Lord himself (1 Pet. 2:6; cf. Rom. 9:33) and Peter the Rock shares his quality (Matt. 16:18); but Qumran's collective interpretation is found also: those united with Christ are themselves living stones built into a mystical temple (Eph. 2:20 ff; 1 Pet. 2:5).¹

The remains of an elaborate water system with its great stepped cisterns are tangible witnesses to the references to purification in the *Manual of Discipline*. It appears that these baths were not a ceremony of initiation but rather a privilege of tried members: moral purity had first to be proved before admission to the purifications was conceded. It is therefore difficult to decide the part these played in the process of sanctification, but unlike the usual Jewish purifications they seem to have enjoyed a certain efficacy in relation to sin. The stain of guilt affected even the body; it must be progressively removed day by day until the final messianic purification by the spirit of holiness—the definitive messianic baptism.²

As Josephus describes it the baptism of John is scarcely distinguishable from any purification at Qumran: John's baptism was administered 'with the purification of the body in view once the soul had been purified by justness.' But Josephus had not the whole story; the gospels are more fully informed and the high light of their portrait is the prophetic and urgent nature of John's mission. While at Qumran the devout community of pious scribes laboured to prepare for the time of the Visit, applying to themselves the Isaian text: 'In the desert prepare the way of the Lord,' and adding, 'this "way" is the study of the Law,' a few miles away the Baptist was crying: 'The axe is even now laid to the root.' For that reason his baptism was not a series of purifications but an urgent, final, unique ceremony. For him there was no preparatory term of probation; there was no time to waste; humble acceptance of his baptism was part of the act of conversion itself. John was no patient scribe, he was a resolute prophet with a sure sense that his vocation pressed, conscious that his own 'manifestation' was a sign of the imminence of Judgment. Nor was his baptism for a tried *élite*: even the Sadducees, who would have

¹ There is similarity, too, in the method of O.T. exegesis which is neither Rabbinic nor allegorical. The reason is that both the sectaries and the Christians considered that they lived at the end of times: for Christianity the time had come, for Qumran it was imminent. Consequently the O.T. is taken up and applied in each to the present time. Nevertheless, exaggeration in this matter must be avoided. Thus both Qumran and N.T. (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11; Heb. 10:37 f) take up Hab. 2:4 which speaks of *fidelity* to God's will. Qumran applies the text to the Teacher, N.T. to our Lord. But the perspectives differ: the Teacher is not an object of faith for Qumran as Christ is for Christianity. We should therefore understand, against Dupont-Sommer, 'loyalty to the teaching of the Teacher' rather than faith in him as redeemer. cf. S. E. Johnson, l.c., p. 165.

² On all this cf. *Lumière et Vie*, March, 1956, pp. 254

had short shrift from Qumran, were welcome if in truth they feared the coming wrath. And it would have shocked the sectaries to hear John ordering his baptised soldiers and publicans back to their work with all its pagan contaminations. Moreover the Baptist aimed at the purification of a whole people for the Messiah's coming, a national appeal perhaps, but not confined to the sons of Abraham, for God could raise such from the stones. If we speak of 'baptism' in relation to Qumran and to St John the Baptist, we should do well to recall the distance between the self-performed, recurrent, leisurely nature of the one and the unique, urgent character of the other that John himself administered in the full consciousness of his individual, personal mission. The rite remains, its significance has changed.¹

The early Christians, like the Qumran community, looked upon themselves as the faithful remnant of the true Israel. Both movements claimed the same titles: 'the elect of God,' 'the poor ones,' 'those of the Way,' and pledged their loyalty to a 'new Alliance.'² Both met periodically for their sacred meal, a rehearsal of the great messianic banquet in the latter days. At Qumran only the fully fledged members—the *Rabbim*—partook. Seniority was carefully regulated: presiding priest, priests according to age, layfolk. Though possibly unjust to the pursuit of humility at Qumran it is difficult not to recall our Lord's 'Be not called *rabbi*' (Matt. 23:8) and the competition for precedence at the Last Supper (Luke 22:24-7) which Jesus shamed by his own startling example (John 13:4-16). The president then blessed and divided the bread and the wine and each at table proceeded to do the same in turn. Here, therefore, we have a sacred meal in which bread and wine are prominent, with rules laid down for their blessing. The analogy with the Last Supper is unmistakable though in one important respect it breaks down: not the president only but each at table takes and blesses his own food. This ritual and sacred ceremony at Qumran emphasised the common fellowship of the society, the communion of the priest with others and of others together.

With the evidence of this thoroughly Jewish community before our eyes the thesis becomes more than ever untenable that St Paul under pagan influence introduced a ritual character into our Lord's

¹ John's seemingly self-contradictory phrase foretelling Christ's baptism 'in the Holy Spirit and in fire' (sanctification as opposed to condemnation) gets some light from the *Manual* which compares the spirit not only with cleansing water but also with a purifying furnace. Hence though the 'fire' of the Baptist is indeed a fire of judgment (Matt. 3:10-12), it may also include the idea of purification.

² But here again we must set a phrase in its historical context: Qumran's application to the Law together with the nature of its hopes for the future invite us to think rather of a renewed than of a new Alliance.

last meal with his disciples which was in fact commonplace in all except that it was his last. An unritual primitive Christianity is a mirage.¹ But whereas the fathers had eaten manna in the desert, and in the desert the Community of the Alliance celebrated its rite of bread and wine, the ceremony of the Upper Room was endowed with an entirely new significance. The disciples there were united with the priestly Messiah presiding at the table, sacramentally gathered into that Body which was to die and rise. Here again it is the historical intervention of Christ's person that marks Christianity off from Qumran.² It is true that for Christian disciples, as for the Community, the Meal is a rehearsal of the great messianic banquet where many shall sit down with Abraham in the Kingdom: and it is true that though the Resurrection of Christ be achieved in fact and of the disciples in principle—by reason of union with the Body—the Christian's manifest resurrection awaits the future³: the union is maintained, sacramentally, 'until he come.' Yet in the mind of Christ and of his disciples all is already consummated.

This is not Qumran but, once granted the Christ-event, Qumran might feel its appeal. Nor would the Community be surprised by the sacrificial atmosphere of the Last Supper.⁴ Voluntary exiles from the Temple sacrifice, they seem to have regarded their ritual meals as a substitute,⁵ as an official and communal act analogously sacrificial like their whole devotional life which was 'a sacrifice of praise.' This would explain the statement Josephus makes of the Essenes: that while refusing to enter the Temple they offered their own sacrifice at home.⁶

Israel's tradition looked back upon the Exodus as upon the idyllic time of honeymoon: in the first days of their union God had taken Israel into the desert and spoken to her heart. The 'spirituality of the

¹ cf. Bouyer, *La Bible et l'Évangile*, 1953, pp. 255-7

² Whether any light is thrown by Qumran on the date of the Last Supper is open to question. The Community preferred the solar calendar to the lunar reckoning of the official clergy. For them 'the sun is the measure of the world'—a statement which might have something to do with the absurd allegation of sun-worship among the Essenes. An attempt on these lines has been made to solve the famous Johannine versus Synoptic controversy: our Lord may have followed the solar calendar of Qumran, the official priesthood the lunar calculation. It has been recently suggested that the Last Supper may therefore have occurred on Tuesday, cf. A. Jaubert, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions*, 1954, pp. 140-73. The suggestion perhaps raises more difficulties than it solves.

³ On the paradoxical intermingling of present and future in the Christian message cf. *Revue Biblique*, 1955, pp. 9-11

⁴ cf. J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, Oxford, 1955, pp. 142-52

⁵ Thus G. Vermès, *Les Manuscrits du Désert de Juda*, 1954, p. 61

⁶ Bones of sheep, lambs, etc., have recently been discovered on the Khirbet Qumran site, carefully stored in jars. 'They are certainly the remains of sacred meals celebrated by the community. This discovery is of great importance. Its explanation is evidently to be found in religious ordinances of which no trace has yet been found in the documents.' Père de Vaux in *Revue Biblique*, 1956, p. 74.

desert' is a legacy of this tradition. And so it was that the monks of Qumran sought God in the desert of Juda; in the same desert our Lord outfaced the tempter; to the same desert St John the Baptist withdrew from his home in 'a city of Juda,' preparing for his manifestation to Israel. It seems impossible that John should have known nothing of the great monastery on the bare plateau by the Dead Sea; most unlikely that he was unacquainted with its practices and its hopes. Nor is it extravagant to conjecture that he sought conversation with—even advice from—hermits older than himself.¹

But that these probabilities are confirmed by the New Testament evidence seems to us difficult to prove. John's invitation to repentance, his threat of vengeance and of lasting fire, these are echoed in the Qumran literature but we confess to finding the similarities not striking. As for his baptismal rite, the practice of baptising proselytes to Judaism existed demonstrably in the first century A.D. and probably earlier. These baptisms may have been John's model.² And even if such baptisms were not at that time tolerated as substitutes for circumcision, fully initiating the proselyte into the Jewish community, they were at least documents of separation from old pagan ways—evidence of a *metanoia*, or change of heart, such as the Baptist demanded. On this as on other points it may be prudent to beware lest the *éclat* of the new discoveries make us forget that if Qumran is a branch of Essenism, Essenism itself is part of a wider tradition upon which the Baptist may independently have drawn. In its final and, we may say, its initiatory character his baptism is nearer to proselyte baptism than it is to the practices of Qumran.

Perhaps the strongest argument for the Baptist's familiarity with the sect in its headquarters at Qumran is an indirect one. It is considered reasonably certain that St John the evangelist was the Baptist's disciple (cf. Jn. 1:35-40). Now we have remarked the affinities of the fourth gospel with the light and darkness theme which is so characteristic of the Community. It is possible, therefore, that the Baptist's young disciple, instructed in this outlook upon the spiritual world, came to see his divine master's career in those terms. It may be so. But on the other hand the explanation offered above for a similar phenomenon in the Epistle to the Hebrews may be sufficient to account for the viewpoint of the Johannine literature also. It is worthy of note, in any case, that we have here one more piece of evidence of authenti-

¹ In A.D. 54 Josephus Flavius, then aged sixteen, went to stay with an Essene hermit and remained for three years.

² cf. O. Cullmann, *Baptism in the New Testament*, London, 1954, p. 9: 'Judaism already knows of the baptism of proselytes coming over from heathenism. John the Baptist holds all Jews to be like proselytes and demands a baptism to forgiveness of sins from them all, in view of the impending appearance of the Messiah.'

cally Jewish contact in a gospel which was once thought to be so exclusively Greek.

The conditions Qumran sought ultimately to change, Christianity engaged to work with. Our Lord said: 'Render to Caesar' and, of the Pharisees, 'what they say to you observe' (Matt. 22:21; 23:3). Nor was the break with the Sadducean priesthood of his making, though when that priesthood presided over his condemnation Qumran must have felt a sympathy which might later blossom into acceptance. As for the meeting of minds, there was surely opportunity. For several years Christianity was Palestinian and the break with Judaism gradual: even in the second century Justin the Christian and Trypho the Jew could carry on a measured discussion. In the same century the *Pastor of Hermas*, written undoubtedly by a Christian, seems to show clearly the influence of Qumran's doctrine of the Two Spirits working against each other in man, and the *Pastor's* conception of the Church as a body of penitents is almost a definition of the Community of the Alliance.¹ Literary contact with writings like the moral instructions of the *Manual* are entirely probable for the first century. It has even been suggested² that our gospel of St Matthew, 'a manual for teaching and administration within the church,' is a kind of *Manual of Discipline* for the Christian movement. It is certainly true that Matthew's use of the Old Testament, not as a source of rules for life, but as prophecy shown to be fulfilled, is not at all Rabbinic but entirely in keeping with the method of Qumran.

We cannot know how in fact Qumran and its sympathisers answered to the impact of Christ. We can only say that the spiritual fervour of the monks, their fraternal love, their pursuit of the heart's purity, their conviction of the power of God's grace (unstressed by the Pharisees), all these qualities made of them ideal soil for the seed of Christianity. They were truly God's poor, the poor who are pronounced blessed in the Beatitudes. We do an injustice to Judaism if we forget them—but indeed they have recently thrust themselves on our notice.

ALEX. JONES

Upholland College
Wigan

¹ On the literary relationship of the *Duae Viae* and of the *Pastor* to the *Manual of Discipline* cf. Audet, *Revue Biblique*, 1952, pp. 219-38; 1953, pp. 41-82.

² K. Stendahl, *The School of St Matthew*, 1954.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(The mention of books in this list neither implies nor precludes
subsequent review)

H. Schlier, *Die Zeit der Kirche*. Herder, Freiburg 1956. Pp. 314. Price not stated.

Das Buch Jesus Sirach, Die Heilige Schrift für das Leben erklärt, Band VII/2. Othmar Schilling. Herder, Freiburg 1956. Pp. 217. Price not stated.

The Holy Bible, Douay Version, Catholic Truth Society, London 1956. 6s.

Thanks to a benefactor's generosity the C.T.S. is now able to offer the Douay Version at a price comparable with those distributed so widely by non-Catholic Bible societies.

Pénitence et Pénitences, Cahiers de la Roseraie II, par T. Maertens, O. Rousseau, P. Anciaux, A. M. Henry, J. Delépierre, L. Evelyn, C. Moeller. Editions de Lumen Vitae, Bruges 1953. Pp. 217. Price not stated.

This book contains the following essays: Asceticism in the Scriptures; Lent according to the Liturgy; History of the Penitential discipline and theology of the sacrament of Penance; The theology of Penance; Christian renunciation; The sacrament of Penance and present-day psychology; The practice of asceticism.

The Holy Bible, translated from the Original Languages with critical use of all the ancient sources, by members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America. Vol. III, *The Sapiential Books: Job to Sirach*. St Anthony Guild Press, Paterson, New Jersey 1955. Pp. 712. \$5.00.

Ronald Knox, *The Window in the Wall*. Burns & Oates, London 1956. Pp. 130. 15s.

This is a collection of sermons on the Holy Eucharist, preached by Mgr. Knox for the Forty Hours at the church of Corpus Christi, Maiden Lane.

Dictionnaire de la Bible Supplément, fascicule XXVIII. Librairie Letouzey et Ané, Paris 1955. Col. 255. Price not stated.

In this fascicule the article on *Médiation* is continued by C. Spicq, O.P., who deals with the New Testament. The other more important articles are on Mesopotamia: its history by E. Cavaignac, and its religion by R. Follet, S.J.; on Messianism by A. Gelin, P.S.S. and on the Book of Micheas by A. George, S.M.

Thierry Maertens, *L'Eloge des Pères (Ecclésiastique XLIV-L)*. Editions de l'Abbaye de Saint-André, Bruges 1956. Pp. 208 + huit illustrations en héliogravure. 96 fr. belges.

These chapters of *Ecclesiasticus (Ben Sira)* are a most valuable example of how the chosen people reread their ancient traditions, and realised, under divine guidance, the present and the future significance of the great ones of the past. They are an inspired lesson in the spiritual interpretation of the word of God. This book is therefore particularly valuable for the present time when there is considerable confusion about the spiritual interpretation of the Bible.

ls
:
y
ve
fr.
ne
e,
an
is
on